

position. The importance of this difference is also twofold. The overlap provides strength as well as allowing for watertight sealing without using direct compression gaskets. Also, the overlap provides tamper proof security to any enclosed documents. The tortuous path to the interior of the document box from the outside will foil would be vandals.

Claim 2 depends from allowable claim 1 as well as adding its own patentable limitations. The claim adds the feature of the interior posting board being removable for cleaning and/or replacement. This is important as cork or particle boards will deteriorate with heavy use and replacement of the board is relatively inexpensive compared with replacing the entire docket box.

Claim 5 depends from allowable claim 1 as well as adding its own patentable limitations. The claim adds the feature of the entire front cover including the overlapping top, bottom, and side walls, being transparent. This feature is important primarily for manufacturing economy because the entire front section may be formed from a single sheet of transparent material. In practice, it is vacuum molded from high strength plastic material.

Claim 6 depends from allowable claim 1 as well as adding its own patentable limitations. The claim adds a lock means to the hinged front cover. This adds the important additional function of document security to the already present feature of protection from the elements. Locking the box allows important materials to be passed between key holders without possibility of theft by others not authorized. The transparent nature of the box also allows one to see at a distance whether there are documents present to be picked up.

The Examiner rejected claims 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Hindle in view of Sabadics. This rejection is respectfully traversed. The Examiner relied upon Sabadics as showing a general purpose mounting bracket for a post. However, the bracket of Sabadics is not monolithic with a back wall structure as is now claimed mounting brace means. The bracket of Sabadics is also not raised, rectangular as now claimed in parent claim 1. Amended claims 3 and 4 depend from allowable claim 1 and each adds its own patentable distinction. Claim 3 adds aligned recesses on opposite sides of the raised rectangular mounting brace means for accommodating a post. Claim 4 adds raised protrusions with keyhole slots for accommodating mounting to a vertical wall.

The claims in this application have been revised to more particularly define applicants' unique construction in view of the prior art of record. No new matter has been added and the new limitations in the claims are fully supported in the original specification and drawings.

The Draftsman's objections to the drawings as filed have been noted. These objections will be taken care of upon the filing of the formal, inked drawing boards, which will be accomplished no later than upon submission of the issue fee.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition to be passed to issue. If such is not the case, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney at the number given below in an effort to satisfactorily conclude the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Terrance L. Siemens
Registration No. 32,382
(703) 685-5226